Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 6558 Case file # 95-260296.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in guilty plea.

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 2:45 PM (Time), 03/15/2001 (Date)

File #: 95-260296

Laboratory #(s): 40319014
40327050

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	☐		☐	☐
VI, MQ	☐	X		☐	☐
	☐	☐		☐	☐

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of:

Testimony Date(s): Pages:

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 40319014/40327050 Date: June 6, 1984

Laboratory Number: 4031/40327050 Date: Aug 8, 1984

Laboratory Number: Date:

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ

Laboratory Number: 40319014
40327050

Initials:

CRM - 13754

Was any other material reviewed? X☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: Submitting agency letters (dated 2-29-84 and 3-21-84)

Results of Review

File #: 95-260296 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q11, Q43-Q45, K1, K2, K5, K6

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available **at the time of the original examination(s)**?
☐ Yes ☐ No X ☐ Unable to Determine

2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes? ☐ Yes X ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

X☐ Transcript not available.

3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Initials: JM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-260296

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, even with the best notes, there is no way to determine the comparison was performed correctly. The fibers were examined appropriately.

#2: The examination results set forth in the laboratory report are supported by the bench notes, but the documentation is marginally adequate. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil. RQ uses abbreviations to indicate the microscopic characteristics of the hair. These abbreviations are difficult to interpret. The technician's notes do not document that hair were recovered from Q43 or Q45.

Review completed at: 3:15 PM (Time), 03/15/2001 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0:30 hours

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts — 03/15/2001

(Signature) (Date)

Initials: SR